

Remarks

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification; objected to claims 8, 9, 12, 30, 31, 34, 47, and 53 based on informalities; rejected claims 16 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1-5, 8, 9, 13-17, 23-27, 30, 31, 35-39, 45-49, 52-55, and 58-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0249801 to Kapur (“Kapur”); rejected claims 6, 7, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kapur and the document “How to get a site listed in Google Glossary?” (“Maurer”); rejected claims 10-12, 32-34, 50 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and U.S. Published Patent Application 2004/0073541 to Lindblad et al. (“Lindblad”); rejected claims 18, 19, 40, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and U.S. Patent 6,922,809 to Coden et al. (“Codan”); and rejected claims 20-22, 42-44, 51, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and U.S. Patent No. 6,701,309 to Berrerman et al. (“Beeferman”).

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended the specification to improve form, amended claims 1, 2, 4, 6-9, 12, 15, 18, 20, 22-24, 26, 28-31, 34, 37, 40, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49, 51-53, 55, 57, 58, and 60 to improve form, and canceled claims 5, 16, 27, 38, 45, and 59 without prejudice or disclaimer.

In view of the amendments to the specification and to the claims, Applicant submits that the objections to the disclosure and to the claims are obviated and should be withdrawn.

Further, Applicant submits that the rejections of claims 16 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are obviated in view of the cancellation of these claims.

*Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)
Based on Kapur*

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 13-17, 23-27, 30, 31, 35-39, 45-49, 52-55, and 58-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Kapur.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a reference disclose each of the elements recited in the claims. See MPEP § 2131. Kapur, in contrast, does not disclose or suggest each of the features recited in the claims.

Amended claim 1, for example, is directed to a system providing definitions. The system includes a server receiving a phrase to be defined, determining a plurality of documents each containing at least one definition, and matching the phrase to at least one of the definitions from the plurality of documents. The system further includes a user interface presenting one or more definitions, determined based on the matching, for the phrase.

Kapur is directed to a universal search interface. (Kapur, Title). According to Kapur, a universal interface is configurable to interface with multiple applications resident on users' computers. (Kapur, paragraph 0007). One of these applications, as described by Kapur, appears to be a dictionary application that, when the user enters the phrase "define (argument)," where argument is a text term for which a definition is sought, the system of Kapur locates the dictionary definition and provides it to the user as a separate web page. (Kapur, paragraph 0176).

Kapur in no way discloses or suggests a server receiving a phrase to be defined, determining a plurality of documents each containing at least one definition, and matching the phrase to at least one of the definitions from the plurality of documents. In

contrast, the dictionary application of Kapur, in response to receiving the text term for which a definition is sought, is described as “locating [locates] the dictionary definition and provides it to the user.” (Kapur, paragraph 0176). Kapur does not disclose any additional details as to how the definition is located. If anything, it appears to Applicant that Kapur is likely to simply lookup the definition in a standard dictionary. This interpretation of Kapur is supported by Fig. 8 of Kapur, in which a definition result is given as a single definition that appears to include a link through which the user may “View Complete Definition in the American Heritage Dictionary.” (Kapur, Fig. 8). It can be appreciated that presenting definitions in the manner recited in claim 1, which includes determining a plurality of documents each containing at least one definition, and matching the phrase to at least one of the definitions from the plurality of documents, is not disclosed or suggested by looking up a term in a dictionary, as disclosed by Kapur.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner appears to contend that the web results shown in Fig. 8 of Kapur somehow relate to the documents recited in claim 1. (Office Action, page 4). Applicant submits that the web results shown in Fig. 8 of Kapur in no way disclose or suggest the features of amended claim 1. Kapur states, in describing Fig. 8:

The system locates the dictionary definition and provides it to the user as a separate web page. In this example, the system also performs a search for the argument and provides the results below the definition as shown.

(Kapur, paragraph 0176). As described by Kapur, the “web results” shown in Fig. 8 appears to be search results corresponding to a standard web search that is performed based on the terms for which the user is seeking a definition. Such a standard search in no way discloses or suggests the specific features recited in claim 1 for presenting one or more definitions, determined based on a matching, for a phrase that is to be defined.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Kapur does not disclose or suggest each of the features recited in amended claim 1 and the rejection based on Kapur is therefore improper and should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 2-5, 8, 9, 13-15, and 17 based on Kapur are also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claim 1.

Claims 2-5, 8, 9, 13-15, and 17 recite additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by Kapur. Amended claim 4, for example, recites that the determining includes performing a search based on a search query that includes a predetermined term indicative of a presence of definitions. Kapur completely fails to disclose or suggest any such feature.

Independent claims 23 and 46 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Kapur. Claims 23 and 46 recite certain features similar to, although not necessarily identical in scope to, those recited in claim 1. Accordingly, based on rationale similar to that given above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 23 and 46 are also improper and should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 24-27, 30, 31, 35-37, and 39 based on Kapur are also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 23.

Claims 24-27, 30, 31, 35-37, and 39 recite additional features that are not disclosed or suggested by Kapur. Amended claim 26, for example, recites that the determining includes performing a search based on a search query that includes a predetermined term indicative of a presence of definitions. Kapur completely fails to disclose or suggest any such feature.

Independent claim 47 also stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Kapur. Claim 47 is directed to a system for determining definitions from distributed information stores. The system includes a search engine identifying a plurality of documents based on a search query including terms indicative of a presence of definitions, and storing information regarding each identified document. The system further includes a search front end matching a phrase for which a definition is sought against the stored information for each identified document, fetching each identified document from the distributed information store and returning one or more matching definitions, and presenting each matching definition.

Applicant submits that Kapur does not disclose or suggest each of the features recited in amended claim 47. Kapur, for example, does not disclose or suggest a search engine identifying a plurality of documents based on a search query including terms indicative of a presence of definitions, as recited in amended claim 47. In contrast, Kapur, as previously discussed, discloses a dictionary application that, in response to receiving the text term for which a definition is sought, “locates the dictionary definition and provides it to the user.” (Kapur, paragraph 0176). Kapur does not disclose any additional details as to how the definition is located. The dictionary application of Kapur in no way discloses or suggests the system for determining definitions recited in claim 47, which includes a search engine identifying a plurality of documents based on a search query including terms indicative of a presence of definitions.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Kapur does not disclose or suggest each of the features recited in claim 47. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 47 based on Kapur is improper and should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 48, 49, 51,

and 52 based on Kapur are also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 47.

Independent claims 53 and 60 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Kapur. Claims 53 and 60 recites certain features similar to, although not necessarily identical in scope to, those recited in claim 47. Accordingly, based on rationale similar to that given above with respect to claim 47, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 53 and 60 are also improper and should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 54, 55, 57, and 58 based on Kapur are also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claim 53.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Based on Kapur in view of Maurer

Dependent claims 6, 7, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and Maurer. Applicant submits that at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claims 1 or 23, the rejection of claims 6, 7, 28, and 29 is improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Based on Kapur in view of Lindblad

Dependent claims 10-12, 32-34, 50, and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and Lindblad. Applicant has reviewed Lindblad, and submits that Lindblad does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with respect to independent

claims 1, 23, 47, and 53. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claims 10-12, 32-34, 50, and 56 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Based on Kapur in view of Coden

Dependent claims 18, 19, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and Coden. Applicant has reviewed Coden, and submits that Coden does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with respect to independent claims 1 and 23. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claims 18, 19, 40, and 41 are improper and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
Based on Kapur in view of Beeferman

Dependent claims 20-22, 42-44, 51, and 57 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Kapur and Beeferman. Applicant has reviewed Beeferman, and submits that Beeferman does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 23, 47, and 53. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claims 20-22, 42-44, 51, and 57 are improper and should be withdrawn.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of this application and the allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this

paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Harrity Snyder, L.L.P.

By: /Brian E. Ledell/

Brian Ledell

Reg. No. 42,784

Date: June 27, 2006

11350 Random Hills Road
Suite 600
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Telephone: 571-432-0800
Facsimile: 571-432-0808